

PPG



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22315-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/607,170	06/29/2000	Tanmoy Dutta	MSFT-0178/150708.1	7941

7590 12/23/2003

John E McGlynn
Woodcock Washburn Kurtz MacKiewicz & Norris LLP
46th Floor
One Liberty Place
Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER

LIN, KENNY S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/607,170

Applicant(s)

DUTTA ET AL.

Examiner

Kenny Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Haverstock et al (hereinafter Haverstock), US 2002/0038357.
4. Haverstock was cited in the last office action.

5. As per claims 1 and 12, Haverstock taught the claimed invention including a computer-implemented method for controlling access to documents during a workflow (pp. 0009, 0012, 0027), comprising:

- a. upon entry of a base document into a workflow, creating a working copy of the base document (pp. 0018, 0025);
- b. selectively providing a user access to either the base document or the working copy of the base document depending upon the identity of a user (pp. 0046, 0057, 0060, 0065-0071); and
- c. selectively providing access to perform operations on the working copy of the base document depending upon the identity of a user (pp. 0057, 0060, 0066-0071).

6. As per claim 2, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1.

Haverstock further taught the method to further comprising:

- a. storing access control list data in relation to the base document, the access control list data defining access controls on performing operations of the working copy of the base document (pp. 0063, 0065-0071); and
- b. storing security descriptor data in relation to the base document and the working copy of the base document, the security descriptor data defining access controls on reading the base document and the working copy of the base document (pp. 0063, 0065-0066, 0069).

7. As per claims 3-4, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 2.

Haverstock further taught that wherein the step of selectively providing access to perform operations on the working copy of the base document depending upon the identity of a user (pp. 0065-0066), further comprises:

- a. determining using the access control list data stored in relation to the base document that a user has/does not have permission to perform an operation on the copy of the base document (pp. 0057, 0063, 0065-0066, 0070-0071); and
- b. allowing/denying the user to perform the operation on the copy of the base document (pp. 0057).

8. As per claims 5-6, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 2.

Haverstock further taught wherein the access control list data comprises information identifying for each of a plurality of operations, the set of users that have permission to perform the operation, and said act of selectively providing access to perform operations on the working copy of the base document depending upon the identity of a user (pp. 0065-0071), further comprises:

- a. referencing the information identifying for each of a plurality of operations, the set of users that have permission to perform the operation (pp. 0067-0071); and
- b. if the user is/is not in the set of users that have permission to perform the operation, providing/denying access to the operation (pp. 0057).

9. As per claim 7, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 5.

Haverstock further taught that wherein the set of users are defined in terms of the roles that have

Art Unit: 2154

permission to perform the operation (pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0066), and said act of referencing the information identifying for each of a plurality of operations, the set of users that have permission to perform the operation (pp. 0065-0071), further comprises:

- a. resolving for the user the set of roles to which the user has been assigned (pp. 0057); and
- b. determining using the set of roles to which the user has been assigned and the set of users defined in terms of the roles that have permission to perform the operation, whether the user has permission to perform the requested operation (pp. 0065-0071).

10. As per claims 8-9, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 2. Haverstock further taught wherein the step of selectively providing a user access to either the base document or the working copy of the base document depending upon the identity of a user (pp. 0065-0066), further comprises:

- a. determining using the security descriptor data stored in relation to the base document and the working copy document, that a user has/does not have permission to read the working copy of the base document (pp. 0057, 0063, 0065-0066, 0070-0071); and
- b. providing/denying the user access to the working copy of the base document (pp. 0057).

11. As per claim 10, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 2. Haverstock further taught wherein the security descriptor data comprises information identifying the set of users that have permission to read each of the base document and the working copy of the base document (pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0066), and said act of selectively providing access to either the base document or the working copy of the base documents depending on the identity of the user (pp. 0065-0071), further comprises:

- a. referencing the information identifying the set of users that have permission to read each of the base document and the working copy of the base document (pp. 0067-0071); and
- b. if the user is in the set of users that have permission to read the working copy of the base document, providing access to the working copy of the base document (pp. 0057).

12. As per claim 11, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 10. Haverstock further taught wherein the set of users are defined in terms of the roles that have permission to read each of the base document and the working copy of the base document, and said act of referencing the information identifying the set of users that have permission to read each of the base document and the working copy of the base document (pp. 0065-0071), further comprises:

- a. resolving for the user the set of roles to which the user has been assigned (pp. 0057); and

- b. determining using the set of roles to which the user has been assigned and the set of user defined in terms of the roles that have permission to read each of the base document and the working copy of the base document, whether the user has permission to read the base document or the working copy of the base document (pp. 0065-0071).

13. As per claim 13, Haverstock taught the claimed invention including a system for providing document isolation in a workflow environment (pp. 0009, 0012, 0027), comprising:

- a. a processor, wherein said processor is operable to execute instructions for performing the following acts (pp. 0011):
 - i. maintaining for a base document undergoing a publishing workflow, a copy of the base document (pp. 0018, 0025);
 - ii. maintaining access control data in relation to the base document and the copy of the base document (pp. 0063, 0065-0066); and
 - iii. upon receipt of a request to access the base document, selectively determining based on the access control data, to provide access to either the base document or the copy of the base document (pp. 0057, 0065-0071).

14. As per claim 14, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 13. Haverstock further taught wherein the access control data comprises security descriptor data

identifying the set of users that have permission to read the base document and the copy of the base document (pp. 0057, 0065-0071).

15. As per claim 15, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 14. Haverstock further taught wherein said processor is operable to execute instructions for performing the following further acts:

- a. referencing the security descriptor data (pp. 0067-0071); and
- b. determining that a user should be directed to the copy of the base document based on the security descriptor data (pp. 0057, 0060, 0066-0071).

16. As per claim 16, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 15. Haverstock further taught wherein the security descriptor data identifies a set of roles corresponding to the set of users that have permission to read the base document and the copy of the base document, and wherein said processor is operable to execute instructions for performing the further act of determining the set of roles that a user has been assigned (pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0071).

17. As per claim 17, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 13. Haverstock further taught wherein the access control data comprises access control list data identifying the set of users that have permission to perform operations on the copy of the base document (pp. 0057, 0065-0071).

18. As per claim 18, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 17.

Haverstock further taught wherein said processor is operable to execute instructions for performing the following further acts:

- a. referencing the access control list data (pp. 0067-0071).; and
- b. determining that a user should be allowed to perform an operation on the copy of the base document based on the access control list data (pp. 0057, 0060, 0066-0071).

19. As per claim 19, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed in claim 18.

Haverstock further taught wherein the access control list data identifies a set of roles corresponding to the set of users that have permission to perform operations on the copy of the base document, and wherein said processor is operable to execute instructions for performing the further act of determining the set of roles that a user has been assigned (pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0071).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

20. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

21. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haverstock, US 2002/0038357, in view of Sudama et al (hereinafter Sudama), US 5,555,375.

22. Haverstock and Sudama were cited in the last office action.

23. As per claim 20, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method of updating access controls to reflect the addition of a new operation (pp. 0060 access privilege changed) that may be performed on a copy of a base document (role-based security with different level of access privilege to the document, pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0071), in a system wherein access to operations to be performed on a copy of the base document are controlled using an access control list which identifies the operations that may be performed and the roles that a user must have to access those operations (pp. 0067-0071), comprising:

- a. new operations that may be performed on copy of a base document (role-based security with different level of access privilege to the document, pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0071);
- b. updating the access control list (pp. 0060).

24. Haverstock did not specifically teach the method to comprise: assigning a unique identifier to the new operation that may be performed on a copy of a base document; updating the access control list to include an entry for the unique identifier for the new operation or to include an entry identifying the roles that have access to the new operation. Sudama taught to assign unique identifier to operations (col.5, lines 33-37, col.8, lines 55-57) for management

purpose. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Haverstock and Sudama because Sudama's teaching of assigning unique identifiers to operations to provide management benefits enables Haverstock's method to manage and keep track of the types of operations performed on the documents using the identifiers.

25. Haverstock and Sudama did not specifically teach the method to comprise updating the access control list to include an entry for the unique identifier for the new operation or to include an entry identifying the roles that have access to the new operation. However, in order to add the new operation and enable the roles to have access to the new operation, the access control list must be updated so the authentication to the existing users is valid with the new operation since the access control list is in correspondence with the operations and user roles. It is an essential step, whether the step is done manually or automatically, that cannot be skipped. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that once a new operation is introduced in Haverstock and Sudama's method, the access control list must be edited to provide up to date authentication to provide existing users, that have the privilege, to execute the new operation.

Response to Arguments

26. Applicant's arguments filed 10/22/2003, regarding claims 1, 13 and 20 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

27. In the remark, applicant argued that (1) As per Claim 1, Haverstock fail to suggest nor teach the limitation of creating a working copy of the base document upon entry of a base document into a workflow, and selectively providing a user access to either the base document or the working copy of the based document depending upon the identity of a user. (2) As per Claim 13, Haverstock fail to suggest nor teach the limitation maintaining a copy of a base document undergoing a publishing workflow, and upon receipt of a request to access the base document, selectively determining based on the access control data to provide access to either the base document or the copy of the based document. (3) Haverstock and Sudama fail to teach or suggest that unique identifiers associated with new operations may be performed on a copy of a base document, and updating an access control list to limit the roles that have access to the operation.

28. Examiner respectfully traverse the argument:

As to point (1), regarding Claim 1, Haverstock taught to create a working copy of the base document (HTML representation) upon entry of a base document (information transmitted to the non-HTML server module) into a workflow (pp. 0018, 0027) and selectively providing a user access to the working copy of the based document depending upon the identity of a user (role-based security with different level of access privilege to the document, pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0071).

As to point (2), regarding Claim 13, Haverstock taught to maintaining a copy of a base document undergoing a publishing workflow (replication, pp. 0025) and upon receipt of a request to access the base document (pp. 0060), selectively determining based on the access control data to

provide access to the copy of the based document (role-based security with different level of access privilege to the document, pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0071).

As to point (3), regarding Claim 20, Haverstock taught the invention substantially as claimed including a method of updating access controls to reflect the addition of a new operation (pp. 0060 access privilege changed) that may be performed on a copy of a base document (role-based security with different level of access privilege to the document, pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0071), in a system wherein access to operations to be performed on a copy of the base document are controlled using an access control list which identifies the operations that may be performed and the roles that a user must have to access those operations (pp. 0067-0071), comprising: new operations that may be performed on copy of a base document (role-based security with different level of access privilege to the document, pp. 0057, 0060, 0065-0071); updating the access control list (pp. 0060). Haverstock did not specifically teach the method to comprise: assigning a unique identifier to the new operation; updating the access control list to include an entry for the unique identifier for the new operation or to include an entry identifying the roles that have access to the new operation. Sudama taught to assign unique identifier to operations (col.5, lines 33-37, col.8, lines 55-57, it is inherent for new operations to have assigned unique identifier) and use the unique identifiers to track the executions of the operations so performances can be notified to the user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Haverstock and Sudama because Sudama's teaching of assigning unique identifiers to operations to provide management benefits enables Haverstock's method to manage and keep track of the types of operations performed on the documents using the identifiers. Haverstock and Sudama did not specifically the updating the

Art Unit: 2154

access control list step to include an entry for the unique identifier for the new operation or to include an entry identifying the roles that have access to the new operation. However, in order to add the new operation and enable the roles to have access to the new operation, it would have been obvious that the access control list must be updated so the authentication to the existing users is valid with the new operation since the access control list is in correspondence with the operations and user roles. It is an essential step, whether the step is done manually or automatically, that cannot be skipped since updating the access control list reflects the new operation and roles (pp. 0060, access privileges and user role update). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to recognize that once a new operation is introduced in Haverstock and Sudama's method, the access control list must be edited to provide up to date authentication to provide existing users, that have the privilege, to execute the new operation.

Conclusion

29. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2154

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

30. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kenny Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-0438. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM Tuesday to Friday and every other Monday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. Additionally, the fax numbers for Group 2100 are as follows:

Official Responses: (703) 872-9306

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-6121.

ksl
December 17, 2003



**JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**